




Docket No.: 248132US6YA

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313



ATTORNEYS AT LAW

RE: Application Serial No.: 10/809,474
Applicants: Hieu A. LAM, et al.
Filing Date: March 26, 2004
For: METHOD AND SYSTEM OF DISCRIMINATING
SUBSTRATE TYPE
Group Art Unit: 1765
Examiner: Anita K. Alanko

SIR:


Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

Provisional Election

Our check in the amount of \$0.00 is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT P.C.


Steven P. Weihrouch
Registration No. 32,829

Customer Number

22850

(703) 413-3000 (phone)
(703) 413-2220 (fax)

Edwin D. Garlepp
Registration No. 45,330

DOCKET NO: 248132US6YA



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF :
HIEU A. LAM, ET AL. : EXAMINER: ALANKO, A.
SERIAL NO: 10/809,474 :
FILED: MARCH 26, 2004 : GROUP ART UNIT: 1765
FOR: METHOD AND SYSTEM OF :
DISCRIMINATING SUBSTRATE TYPE :

PROVISIONAL ELECTION

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the election requirement dated September 25, 2005, Applicants provisionally elect with traverse Group I, Claims 1-10 and 21-22 drawn to a method, for further examination on the merits. Applicants reserve the right to file one or more divisional applications directed to the non-elected invention.

Furthermore, while the Election Requirement asserts that the application contains claims to patentably distinct inventions, MPEP § 803 states the following:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

Although the outstanding Official Action identifies different search classifications, it is believed that the claims of the present application would have to be searched in a handful of sub-classes. Furthermore, since electronic searching is commonly performed, a search may be made of a large number of, or theoretically all, subclasses without substantial additional

Application No. 10/809,474
Reply to Office Action of September 26, 2005

effort. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the Restriction Requirement on the grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a *serious* burden on the Examiner, whereas it would be a serious burden on Applicants to prosecute and maintain separate applications.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the requirement to elect a single group be withdrawn, and that a full examination on the merits of Claims 1-22 be conducted.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Steven P. Weihrouch
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 32,829

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Edwin D. Garlepp
Registration No. 45,330